



**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS  
CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
MEETING OF: APRIL 25, 2001  
BUDGET WORKSHOP**

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2. THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 FRIDAY, APRIL 27TH AT 3:00 PM AND SUNDAY, APRIL 29TH AT 6:30 PM.

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**MINUTES:**

MAYOR GOODMAN called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

PRESENT: MAYOR GOODMAN and COUNCIL MEMBERS REESE, M. McDONALD, BROWN, L.B. McDONALD, WEEKLY, and MACK

Also Present: CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC, CITY CLERK BARBARA JO RONEMUS, and DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE - Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Downtown Transportation Center, City Clerk's Board

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(9:07)

**1-1**

MAYOR GOODMAN led the audience in the Pledge.

(9:07 – 9:08)

**1-15**



SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001  
Additional Comments:

MAYOR GOODMAN stated that in speaking with Mayors across the country he discovered that other entities conduct their budget in secret, unlike the City of Las Vegas. The City, through KCLV Channel 2, makes itself accessible to its citizens so that the public sees what the Council is doing and can express their disapproval or approval. It is an extraordinary situation where the budget is discussed openly and those who are viewing will be able to see what the Council is trying to do to ensure that the City is responding to those concerns, such as the slowing economy. The City of Las Vegas is not growing as quickly as it has in the past. There are concerns regarding appropriation of money due to certain legislation being proposed in Carson City. These issues are very sensitive and the City is very concerned. He applauded the City Manager for having these open proceedings and the Council for standing before the public and having its actions under a great deal of scrutiny.

(9:09 – 9:11)

**1-45**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE  
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS  
CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
MEETING OF: APRIL 25, 2001  
BUDGET WORKSHOP**

---

**DEPARTMENT: FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES**

**DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT**

☐

**CONSENT**

☒

**DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**Fiscal Impact**

☒

**No Impact**

**Amount:**

☐

**Budget Funds Available**

**Dept./Division:**

☐

**Augmentation Required**

**Funding Source:**

**PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

Review and discussion of FY2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 13, 2001.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

No Action Required

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

FY2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MOTION:**

None required

**MINUTES:**

CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE stated that the 2002 Tentative Budget process began with the development of the Strategic Plan in the latter part of 2001. Budget instructions were given to each department in December and feedback was received in February. Beginning February until now, management and staff have been involved in numerous discussions and meetings, all of which involved the directors and the City's upper management team. This year's process has proven to be difficult due to the fact that some of the City's revenue sources are diminishing. In fact, revenue increased only two to three percent and the general signs of the national economy are troublesome. Throughout the process the department heads and their supporting players have responded admirably. They have considered each other's duties, responsibilities and priorities and have come together on what the City's top priorities are for this budget.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

There are only 20 new positions in this budget outside of the firefighters, who are funded through the fire safety initiative using monies that are dedicated solely for those purposes. Even the 20 new positions have strong public safety ties, as those positions are in Detention and Corrections, the Courts, Public Works and Field Operations. This is the lowest staffing level increase in 10 years at the City of Las Vegas. The budget for non-labor cost is nine tenths of one percent more than last year. Although the cost of fuel and utilities will put tremendous pressures on this cost containment, she believes that the department teams worked long and hard to bring a very austere budget before the City Council. She commended them for their team spirit and their willingness to do more with less.

She announced that DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS would present a brief video to show some of the City Council's accomplishments over the last year. After the video, MARK VINCENT, Director, Finance and Business Services, and CANDICE FALDER, Manager, Finance and Business Services, would provide information on the 2002 budget requests and give information as to where the money is coming from and where it is going. ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL will follow with a brief description as to how this request fits in with the City's Strategic Plan, and MR. VINCENT will conclude the presentation and answer questions from the Council.

The video showed Las Vegas as the fastest growing community in the nation for the last 10 years and outlined its many challenges. City staff has and is working hard with innovative ideas and efficient and technical ways of conducting business, such as making payments on-line. The City has also made thousands of pages of information available to all its citizens through the Internet. Yahoo Internet Life Magazine recognized this accomplishment when it rated Las Vegas as the sixth most connected City in the country and first in web page content.

To ensure a safer quality of life, Las Vegas is partnering with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in various crime prevention initiatives, such as National Night Out where community policing connects directly with neighborhoods. The City is also partnering with Metro and Clark County to support the construction of the new police training academy and two new substations within the City this year. The city's Department of Detention and Enforcement is renting excess beds in its detention center to Clark County and the Federal Department of Immigration and Naturalization. To further ensure public safety, four new fire stations will be built within three years, staffed by 96 new firefighters. This is due to a fire initiative passed by the voters last fall.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

Traffic congestion is another challenge that the City, through its partnership with the Regional Transportation Commission, is addressing by building new roads and providing alternative transportation choices. Alta Drive, Jones Boulevard, Craig Road, Durango Drive, Huntridge reconstruction, and the I-15 Freeway Channel are major road projects that have either been completed or are nearing completion. In addition, construction is continuing on the Beltway to relieve traffic stress in the northwest. Increase in traffic means increase in parking, therefore the City is meeting this challenge by the construction of over 1800 new parking spaces downtown and by providing no cost trolley service to transport visitors and workers.

The City has partnered with the Regional Flood Control District in several projects. The most significant is the I-15 Freeway Channel, which will finally end the flooding on the Charleston Underpass. To accommodate growth the City is expanding the capabilities of its waste treatment facilities. Substituting new technology for personnel, these facilities will be saving some \$2.6 million each year. Included in this expansion is the northwest water resource center, which is nearing completion. This 10 million gallon per day facility will produce highly treated reused water; the recycled water will be used on golf courses. Through its involvement with the Southern Nevada Planning Coalition, the City is taking a leadership role in helping to reduce pollutants and increase air quality. The biggest sign of environmental progress has been the rapid increase in parks and green space initiatives. Last year the 65-acre Bettye Wilson Soccer Complex was completed.

Through good solid responsive fiscal management, last year the City through its initiatives, saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. Some examples are merging the CCDC with the Office of Business Development, savings of \$400,000; privatizing the City cemetery, savings of \$600,000; emergency transport covered by the Las Vegas Fire and Rescue, savings of \$800,000; the continuation of the efficiency plan at the Municipal Court, savings of \$5 million and the refinancing of the Summerlin Improvement District, savings of over \$7 million. The City of Las Vegas' challenges are real: growth, traffic, air quality, and public safety. But smart management, business efficiencies and high technology provide good building blocks to build a better Las Vegas.

DEPUTY CITY MANAGER HOUCHENS thanked video services for the presentation. He outlined in detail other City's initiatives, including the implementation of a centralized integrated computer system using modern technology and applying modern industry practices. Today

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

the Information Technologies (IT) operation has become a model enterprise. It is a leader in its field and an example sought after by many of its peers and associates in the technology fields. On the Internet the City receives an average of 35,700 hits per month. If these were phone calls coming into City offices, it would take four full time secretaries to handle them.

The Finance Department implemented Oracle, which has demonstrated to numerous entities the effective use of these state-of-the-art systems. Since the implementation of Oracle, staff has been reduced by 7% without reducing services.

The Purchasing Department implemented a P-Card, replacing the old Field Purchase Order, and streamlined the system. This allowed them to accommodate a 17% increase in purchasing volume with no new staff and a 9% reduction in paperwork. In fact, the paper consumed by the City has been reduced by 3.3 million sheets per year.

Field Operations has become another efficient department. Based on ICMA Benchmarking standard, Field Operations is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of 25 comparable cities for the lowest O & M cost per road mile and ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of 46 ICMA respondents for the lowest O & M costs per park acre.

The water pollution control facility is undergoing major expansion, and industry standards indicate that with the 54% expansion and capacity, they should have a staff of 155 employees. Through efficiency measures, their actual staffing is 107 and predicted to level off at 115, roughly 25% under industry recommendations.

In addition to the bed rental success, Detention and Enforcement has instituted a workers compensation review process that resulted in a 50% reduction in lost time from reported injuries. By increasing their downtown bike patrols, they have reduced vehicles and fuel costs and provided more responsive contact with the citizens.

The City audit program is the most progressive audit function in the State. They operate under the guidance of the City Council in conjunction with an independent audit committee. Their audit findings are all public and distributed as such and have served to provide a high level of operational scrutiny in City Departments, setting a high standard of management for City operations.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

DEPUTY CITY MANAGER HOUCHENS presented a chart depicting that in 1995 there were about 6.8 employees per 1,000 residents. This year that number is 18% less. In terms of administrative and overhead costs, there has been a reduction from 1.36 employees per 1,000 to 1.18, which is the lowest ratio in the Valley. Clearly, this shows that City employees are finding ways to do more with less.

(9:11 – 9:30)

**1-105**

MARK VINCENT, Director, Finance and Business Services, explained that this budget is focused on public safety and that the City has been fortunate that the fire initiative passed. As a result of that, this Tentative Budget contemplates 60 new positions, 47 of those directly related to public safety: 40 for fire and 7 for detention facility. Unfortunately, it is a thin budget for those areas not in public safety. There will be a 4% increase in expenditures from last year and a 3.7% CPI increase. Additionally, there are potential revenue impacts from the Legislature. Through a PowerPoint presentation he outlined the budget overview, capital and general funds, capital expenditures, and public safety issues, etc. The PowerPoint presentation is made a part of the final minutes.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked MR. VINCENT for a brief description of an enterprise fund. MR. VINCENT explained that the enterprise fund operates like a business. The intent is to provide services either to citizens or developers in the case of the Building and Safety fund or provide services to other local entities. The rates charged for those services are based on those actual costs.

MR. VINCENT clarified for MAYOR GOODMAN that the Major Fiscal Year 2002 Capital Expenditures amounts listed are not the total projected expenditures. Typically, capital projects take from 18 to 24 months to complete, and it is conceivable that a project could span three fiscal years. Those amounts listed are planned expenditures for this year.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that the Metro budget contemplated is a reduced budget. In fact, Metro and Fiscal Affairs recognized those Legislature issues that might impact the City's revenues and came up with two alternatives. Alternative one was about \$1.9 million less in total and alternative two was \$5.4 million lower. Fiscal Affairs approved the \$1.9 million. It is conceivable that if both Legislature Bills are approved, the City might have to come back to Metro and ask them to consider alternative number two.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD commented that she and COUNCILMAN REESE have served on the Metropolitan Police Department Fiscal Affairs Committee and concurred with MR. VINCENT's comments. That part of the budget that relates to Metro was revised and scaled back, which if approved in its current form would provide 50 police officers on the street and 49 civilian employees to support those officers. The budget referred to by MR. VINCENT would eliminate all new police officers in the next year's budget and provide only 24 civilian employees, who are the dispatchers who answer the 911 calls and provide support services for Metro. Unfortunately, in the past there have been times when Metro officers had to be taken off the street and put into civilian roles, which jeopardized public safety in the community. She is concerned that even with the scaled back budget, the City is already below the national average in the number of police officers per 1,000 residents. This will further reduce Metro's responsiveness. Citizens of her ward and throughout the City want to see an enhanced police presence. She is concerned that these cuts and the Bills proposed in Carson City will impact Metro's budget.

COUNCILMAN REESE echoed COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD's comments and added that those 24 civilian employees will also help support Metro staff in the new substations proposed in the City of Las Vegas. COUNCILMAN McDONALD discussed with MR. VINCENT that Clark County is facing the same public safety issues and the reduction would also have an impact in Clark County, jeopardizing public safety and crime prevention. MR. VINCENT stated that Metro's reduction would come back in the budget year 2003. COUNCILMAN McDONALD noted that the Senate and other entities need to be made aware of the impact the proposed Legislature Bills would have on the City's public safety.

COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that looking at the proposed budget, he is thankful that the voters passed the fire initiative.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD indicated that oftentimes comments are made that the City of Las Vegas is very generous in giving COLA and CPI increases to its employees. However, it is important for the media, citizens and viewers alike to understand that these increases are a result of the collective bargaining agreements and that the City has a legal obligation to uphold them. MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with MR. VINCENT that if legislation puts the City in a fiscally stressed position, the City would be unable to meet its contractual obligations and that in the collective bargaining agreements themselves are provisions where there are cuts across the board. CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE



SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

indicated that if that were the case, the City would have to prove severe fiscal distress, otherwise the City is legally obligated to the terms of its collective bargaining agreement. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD reiterated that her reason for bringing this issue forward is because it has been presented to the media and others in Carson City that the contract increases are something that the City has discretion over.

COUNCILMAN BROWN discussed with MR. VINCENT that the total revenue projection for capital projects for this year is approximately \$120 million and that 96% of that is non-discretionary. COUNCILMAN BROWN asked about what is available out of the capital fund, what would be new, what would be discretionary, and what would be committed.

With regards to Significant Budget Initiatives, MR. VINCENT mentioned that the Citizen Priority Advisory Committee meets three or four times a year. This committee has been very helpful in helping the City focus on policy initiatives and business process changes. The committee is also involved in the budget process and policies. However, no changes have been made to the budget policies. The committee members supported the City's policy. He added that one new policy implemented last year makes sure that the base budget is developed from cross-trending analysis. He also mentioned the Citizen Priority Advisory Committee members' names: TOM PAULUS, BRIAN PEARSON, BEN JUDD, RONALD BUTTERS, JOHN MEDINA, JOSEPH SAYLES and LORI HARRISON.

COUNCILMAN BROWN questioned an existing facility that has been approved by the Council, targeted for the creation of a downtown community center. He is aware that community centers are needed in the northwest and that some, such as the Mirabelli Community Center, need to be refurbished. However, his concern is that an expectation is created about a project and that then the Council would be looking for ways to fund, maintain and staff those community centers. COUNCILMAN REESE explained that the facility in question is the church located at Ninth Street and Bridger Avenue purchased by the City and approved by the City Council to be converted into a community center. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred with COUNCILMAN REESE's comments and directed staff to provide COUNCILMAN BROWN with that information as soon as possible. COUNCILMAN McDONALD requested that during the discussion regarding community centers, the Mirabelli Center also be addressed. This center provides services for residents of Ward 1 and Ward 2, as well as for COMMISSIONER MAXFIELD's constituents.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that one of the important points brought forward is that labor drives the City's budget. He reiterated that facilities are created with the best intentions, but then the City has to meet an obligation to operate them. In fact, one of the fiscal policies speaks directly to stop approving projects without incorporating the operational costs. His understanding was that the Council approved the purchase of that downtown facility as a potential use for a community center. There has never been a dialogue as to staffing and the cost of retrofitting. MR. VINCENT indicated that some of those costs for refurbishing and retrofitting might be funded by grants, but not for operation costs.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD referred to an article in the Summerlin View stating that a new \$3 million Olympic size pool is being constructed by the Hughes Corporation and that it would be turned over to the City of Las Vegas for operation and maintenance. As part of those negotiations, several facilities currently operated by the City may be turned over to the Summerlin Association. However, will the City be able to accept the \$3 million gift if there are no dollars available in the budget to hire lifeguards and staff to maintain and operate the pool, a pool that the City may not be able to open. A similar situation arose when the State built a prison and could not open it because they could not afford to hire the correction officers to run it.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY stated that his concern is that these new centers and parks are staffed and then they are either underutilized or empty.

(9:30 – 10:20)

**1-740**

MR. VINCENT turned over the presentation to ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL, who tied the City's Strategic Plan into the budget. ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER FRETWELL indicated that staff brought a list of strategies, goals and objectives before the City Council. At that time the Council asked staff to talk about how those strategies integrate with the City's budget, and most of those strategies listed in the PowerPoint presentation are funded in this budget. The PowerPoint presentation was made a part of the final minutes.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD questioned whether the trolley route would be eliminated due to low ridership. He is aware that the City is not making any money for this service. However, this is a question of quality of life and taking care of senior citizens. ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER FRETWELL replied that the reevaluation of those trolley routes at this time is to design them in a way to maximize the ridership. If any major changes would be made to the

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

existing system, it would be brought forward for Council's approval. There may be other solutions by partnering with the Regional Transportation Commission to address those low ridership areas, while maintaining some other routes that are used frequently. COUNCILMAN McDONALD reiterated that his concern is how the trolley's reevaluation might affect the senior citizens. This issue truly needs to be looked at and discussed on how to enhance this service, without affecting the senior citizens.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked if the enhancement of the sidewalk improvement program is meant to enhance older neighborhoods or to install sidewalks where there are none, especially in those areas where many sawtooths exist. ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER FRETWELL replied that LARRY HAUGSNESS, Director, Field Operations, would be answering this question during the discussion portion of the meeting. She concluded by adding that one of the beauties of the strategic plan is that on a regular basis staff brings back their progress so that the Council can constantly realign as they move through the implementation of the plan.

(10:20 – 10:35)

**1-2629**

MR. VINCENT introduced the discussion part of the meeting where he indicated that the Municipal Court is looking at restructuring how it handles its caseload. This would not reflect an impact on Municipal Court, in terms of staffing costs, but more for the Public Defender and the City Attorney's Office. The estimated cost of those additional labor resources for Public Defender and City Attorney's Office is approximately \$350,000, including computers and office space. This is not included in the tentative budget. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked whether there is anything in the Nevada Revised Statutes that states that the City must have a Public Defender from the public sector and if this is an area that there may exist some prohibition on privatization of this area. CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC replied that he does not believe there is a prohibition on privatization. The NRS does not allow the City to form its own Public Defender's office. It requires that it use either the State Public Defender's office, which is the County Public Defender, MR. HARRIS, or that the City use attorneys at a fixed statutory hourly rate. Currently, the City uses the State Public Defender. He informed MAYOR GOODMAN that the rate is \$75.00 per hour, per case. The attorney provides for his own staff, office and secretary. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD indicated that this is something that needs to be explored. MAYOR GOODMAN added that he would be discussing this with JUDGE GREGORY because it is a very substantial item in their budget.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN BROWN referred to the Citizens Priority Advisory Committee and verified with MR. VINCENT that these fiscal policies have been adopted by the City Council as part of the budget in the past and part of this year's budget. He wanted to emphasize that these are the budget policies that are supposed to drive the Council decision-making.

MR. VINCENT stated that another area for consideration is the City Auditor's Office. During the Audit Committee meeting, there was discussion about increasing staffing for their backlog of cyclical audit reports, audit operation and financial audits. In order to shorten that cycle time, MR. SNELDING has submitted a request, not funded in this budget, for four additional staff. MAYOR GOODMAN asked the various departments to address the City Council.

JUDGE MICHELLE LEAVITT, Department 3, Las Vegas Municipal Court, stated that this Court is the busiest Municipal Court in the State of Nevada. They handle 69% of all the criminal matters that go through Municipal Court in the entire State. They have the highest judged case ratio in the State, and, with the increase in Metro officers that this budget contemplates, they see their caseload being impacted even more. Six judges handle all of these cases. They have been researching and studying ways that they can allocate their resources and process more efficiently and more quickly.

JUDGE LEAVITT presented the Council with a plan to redistribute traffic. Currently traffic is handled in Department 2 with one judge and that particular judge does all the traffic arraignments. If the person pleads not guilty, wants to go to trial, then those cases get distributed among the other five judges. The proposal is to evenly redistribute all the criminal and traffic matters among all six departments. This would increase the traffic sessions from four to six sessions a day. Criminal matters would be handled more quickly and more efficiently, thereby pushing these cases to resolution and/or trial quickly. If traffic was evenly distributed and traffic matters came to Department 3, which is fully staffed with a prosecutor and public defender, those cases would be able to be resolved more quickly, alleviating the need for people to come back to court. This would allow for the more serious offenses the attention that they require, such as DUI and domestic violence. It would also allow the judges to absorb the increasing caseload prior to Municipal Court moving over to the Regional Justice Center. The present Municipal Court location has no opportunity to expand or create a new department.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

JUDGE LEAVITT referred to the chart where the expenditures exceed the anticipated revenues. However, she indicated that that included about \$900,000 in expenses to the Public Defender, over which the court has no control in how they allocate their resources. The submitted budget does not include Municipal Court's recent fine and fee increases because Finance was not aware of them and did not factor them into the budget. She believes that with these increases they will be able to absorb any deficit. MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with KEITH GRONQUIST, Acting Court Administrator, that \$500,000 reflects a yearly increase of the fee and fines. JUDGE GREGORY added that these additional fines would compensate for the \$500,000 deficit.

MAYOR GOODMAN stated that he has already spoken to some of the judges about the possibility of replacing the Public Defender with private attorneys. This would be a great opportunity for a young lawyer who wants to make a reputation and gain experience in the courts. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC commented that he would be happy to provide financial information to the courts. However, Public Defenders typically are hired by the courts to represent indigent clients, and he suggested that this should come from management or the Court Administrator. MAYOR GOODMAN directed the City Manager to explore the possibility of replacing the Public Defender with private attorneys and to discuss this issue with Public Defender, MORGAN HARRIS, as well as with District Court Judges, as to its feasibility.

COUNCILMAN MACK stated that it was brought to his attention that the courts currently work under a four-day workweek and suggested that the court go to a five-day workweek and at the same time increase revenues. JUDGE GREGORY replied that at the present time court is held four days and two nights. The reason for this schedule is because the City Attorney's Office uses Friday as their preparation day for the following week to prepare their cases. In addition to the four days and two nights of court, a judge comes in each Saturday and each holiday to handle probable cause hearings. Therefore, the judges are actually working the equivalent of a five-day week or more. The biggest problem would be staffing of the Friday court by the City Attorney. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC added that under the current schedule of the courts, the City Attorney's Office staffs five criminal departments Monday through Thursday, beginning at 7:30 a.m. to six or seven o'clock at night. They will go in for a trial, arraignments and initial appearances, and the schedule rotates throughout the day, which means that Monday through Thursday, their time is occupied with matters in court. These matters include issuing subpoenas for witnesses and interviewing people. Preparing their cases and negotiations between counsels are attempted on Friday. Loss of this Friday would cause a very serious staffing problem. JUDGE GREGORY commented that it is not uncommon for a judge to hold trial on a Friday for a complicated case. However, that puts a burden on the City Attorney's Office.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN BROWN noted that four years ago there was some policy debate whether to turn over Municipal Court to the County. At that time the direction the Council chose was the appropriate one, and the court has done a great job through great leadership in becoming self-sufficient with innovative, creative programs. However, the additional request is inappropriate at this time. Additionally, the request will impact and mandate additional positions. Out of the 13 positions recommended for approval outside the fire and safety positions, three positions are for the court, which also received positions last year. In most cases every new position ends up in perpetuity. The court at this time is recruiting for an Administrator, and he hopes that MR. GRONQUIST reconsiders. With that position open and with the progress that the court has made to date, he recommended that it would be in the best interest of the overall budget perspective that the request for these positions be brought back before the City Council in six months or in next year's budget cycle. JUDGE GREGORY rebutted that by redistributing the caseload the number of traffic court sessions would increase from four to six a day, which means additional income. Usually, the older a case gets the harder it is to bring it to justice and collect any fines. With better organization a considerable amount of additional monies can be brought forth to offset other costs involved. COUNCILMAN BROWN agreed, but stated the issue is that each City Department is being asked to share in the hurt until the Council can get a better idea of what is happening in Carson City.

CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC verified for MAYOR GOODMAN that about \$66,000 a year is expended from the budget for subpoenas. This amount does not include the subpoenas issued by the Public Defender. He discussed with MAYOR GOODMAN that he is not certain how much of that money goes to law enforcement officers. MAYOR GOODMAN replied that he would like that information because it seems unseemly having to subpoena law enforcement officers and pay them to testify. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC replied that the only time an officer is paid for his court appearance is when he testifies when off duty. MAYOR GOODMAN directed COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD and COUNCILMAN REESE that when they go into discussion regarding the Sheriff's budget that they ascertain whether or not the City could save money by having officers testify while they are on duty.

(10:35 – 11:00)

**1-3481/2-1**

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

RADFORD SNELDING, City Auditor, stated that since coming to the City of Las Vegas last June, he has reviewed the audit process and its practices within the City Auditor's office and made some changes. He outlined those changes, some of which were to standardize the audit process, change the format of the reports, establish an audit policy approved by the Council earlier this year, institute a periodic audit follow-up on open recommendations and alter the audit planning process. These changes have not had a significant economic impact. In order to optimize the effectiveness of the Audit Department, he recommended increasing auditable entities, improving risk analysis and auditing on a cyclical basis. These changes would cost the City money.

Historically, the City has audited 77 auditable entities, and the recommendation would be to further break those down to where there would be 173. This amounts to a quicker turnaround on audits and also shorter reports. He clarified for MAYOR GOODMAN that the number increased as a result of breaking down those entities even further. He gave an example by using the Public Works Department and how it could be broken down to components within that organization by unit. He recommended that reports be increased from 38 to 50 per year. Approximately 563 hours per audit have been expended. By breaking the entities down in smaller bites, only 230 hours per audit would be required. At the current rate, the coverage for the City on one audit cycle would be about 13 years. He proposed to cut that down to five years, which would be closer to the industry's best practices.

MR. SNELDING recommended that risk analysis could be improved by dividing auditable entities into high risk, which would be audited on a three-year cycle, medium risk, on a four-year cycle, and low risk, on a five-year cycle. This would allow for additional review for high and medium risk areas and more effective oversight. Currently, a risk value has been assigned to each auditable entity, the higher the risk the higher the value, and then work would be from the high-risk items to the low-risk items. A 13-year cycle, does not give enough attention to the high-risk items. He discussed with MAYOR GOODMAN that the low-risk areas would be those with very little cash handling, which, even though they need the scrutiny, are not as critical because their assets are not as high.

The Audit Department's objectives would be to utilize a systematic cyclical audit methodology, optimally address special requests, address the investigations, systematically review information technology issues and aggressively follow up on previous recommendations.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

Currently, there are four internal auditors and MR. SNELDING requested the addition of four auditors, at a cost of \$288,000 with a set-up cost of \$47,000 for office furniture, desk and telephones, for a total of approximately \$335,000. MAYOR GOODMAN asked for the salary breakdown. MR. SNELDING replied that the auditor's salary would be about \$50,000 with 35% benefits, and that would include retirement, sick leave and vacation time, for a total of \$72,000.

MR. SNELDING stated that the four additional auditors would improve audit coverage, positive economic impact, increased efficiency, enhanced controls and greater oversight.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked CITY MANAGER VALENTINE to explain the process of a new employee's salary, using the auditor position as an example. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE explained that the base salary would be \$50,000, plus benefits that are contributed from the General Fund. MR. VINCENT added that the City contributes to each employee's retirement, medical and disabilities benefits. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE further explained that appointive employees are eligible for a zero to 6% merit increase on their anniversary date and then each July 1<sup>st</sup>, both classified and appointive employees are eligible for a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA). The COLA for the classified employees happens automatically by City of Las Vegas Employee Association (CEA) contract, and the amount varies by year. For the past three years it has been 3.5%, and it will go to 4% this fiscal year. Appointive employees receive the same COLA amount as classified employees. There is a salary range established for each position, whether appointive or classified. It goes on until they reach the top of their salary range, and for the appointive employees this depends on the amount of their merit increase. For both appointive and classified, once they reach that salary range, they would only receive COLA. MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that a \$50,000 position would increase annually based on the amount of the COLA, plus the amount of their merit increases. It could range from 5% to as much as 10% increases.

MR. VINCENT stated that the City also pays longevity benefit for classified employees, starting after the sixth year. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE clarified that the longevity rate begins at half a percent per year up to 10%. This was reduced in a prior contract. Some employees will top out at 15% longevity pay. MR. VINCENT mentioned that employees receive paid holidays, vacation and sick leave. He used an Office Specialist position to describe its schedule. The position starts with a salary of \$25,000, including COLA and longevity and can go to \$100,000 after 20 years. MAYOR GOODMAN expressed concern about how the City would be able to pay



SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

for these salaries years from now and that if something is not done, the City might run out of money. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE stated that if the City's labor costs and total budget continue to go up faster than the City's revenues, then at some point the City would not be able to hire any employees. These are the kind of discussions that the City needs to have when it enters into its collective bargaining negotiations or contractual costs. Most of these provisions also apply to the appointive employees. The contract does provide a reduction in force, which would allow a procedure to reduce the number of employees.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE pointed out that during discussion with the City Directors priorities were agreed upon. In fact, some gave up their requested positions for those who truly needed them. Additionally, the City Manager's Office will be exploring, together with CLAUDETTE ENUS, Director, Human Resources, a voluntary separation, offering an incentive to the most expensive employees to take an early retirement.

COUNCILMAN REESE asked what the City pays for those retired employees. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE explained that PERS is managed as a trust and that money is similar to a trust and it pays for those employees' retirement. Once that employee retires, the City no longer pays into the retirement system for that particular employee. What an employee draws from the retirement system depends upon the amount of years they have been in the system and their salary level. PERS has a board that manages the trust, determines what the investments are, and money that is contributed grows as they invest that money. The system appears to be a healthy system, and they project into the future in order to meet their obligations and those commitments to retired employees. She indicated that MARVIN LEAVITT, who sits on that board, might be able to provide additional information on PERS.

COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that DEPUTY CITY MANAGER HOUCHEMS presented a similar analysis last year on the City's labor costs and expenditures versus revenues. Over the past four years the Council has done a great job in moving forward with initiatives and trying to privatize some of those functions. But it still comes down to labor costs. The City of Las Vegas has been fortunate because for the past 10 to 15 years there has been double digit revenue growth often hiding true expenditures. However, the City is now seeing single digits, coupled with the uncertainty of the Legislative activities and slow economic indicators.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD indicated that if all departments have to do more with less, department heads have to ensure that the City has increased efficiency, enhanced controls, and greater oversight.

CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC corrected for MAYOR GOODMAN that the total witnesses fees that the City paid for police officers is \$63,000 and another \$60,000 to civilian witnesses. Of course, this amount grows with the number of caseloads. The City does not fly in witnesses, unless for an extraordinary case. Generally, the City tries to expend Victim of Crime Act (VOCA) grant money.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD verified with CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC that the City's night court lasts approximately an hour. City attorneys work very closely with police officers, who not only put in grueling hours but also have to appear and testify as witnesses, sometimes in the middle of a workday and before or after their work shift. The attorneys work very hard to ensure that they subpoena the officers during or at the end of their shift. Of course, it is impossible to schedule a court appearance for some officers while on duty because they make their arrests late at night when court is not in session. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the main reason for the police officer to be there is so that the defendant will see that the prosecutor is ready to proceed and will probably enter into a deal. He directed CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC to explore the possibility of creating an affidavit to show that an effort has been made to have the officer present and to show the defendant at the pre-trial that in fact the officer intends to be present and will not be there only if the person wants to make the deal at that time. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC noted that affidavits are usually used with respect to lab experts that Metro provides.

CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC stated that over the last four years there has been a 70% increase in the cases that the City Attorney Criminal Division handles. This is a direct result of the Valley's growth and the expansion of Metro. City Attorney's Office staff work overtime, and in the last three months there has been \$3,000 in overtime. He requested one Office Specialist II position to help process the cases' paperwork. That position would hire at approximately \$30,000, with another \$15,000 in benefits. Without a new position, at some point in time during this next fiscal year, the numbers in overtime will continue to grow. Overtime is a very effective tool for a short-term problem, but if overtime continues to grow, not only will it be more expensive, it will also lower staff's morale.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE discussed with MAYOR GOODMAN that the City uses temporary employees to fill in for employees who are taking family medical leave for an extended period of time, for short duration assignments or projects, on seasonal programs, and during the Municipal elections. They do save the City money. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC verified for MAYOR GOODMAN that a temporary position would suffice for his office. However, there is a training level involved with this specialized position because the employee would have to become very familiar with court documents and the type of forms used. Some of the costs associated with the Office Specialist position are space and equipment. He believes that the increase in caseload is not a temporary problem. MAYOR GOODMAN commented that some of the Council's apprehension is the unknown, especially with the outcome of the Legislature. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC stated that he is willing to bring his request forward again at a later time and will continue to pay overtime without having too much of a significant impact on his staff.

(11:00 – 11:30)

2-648

**FINAL COMMENTS:**

COUNCILMAN REESE thanked the City Manager's Office and MR. VINCENT for the extraordinary presentation and expressed his appreciation to all City departments and employees for their efforts. The City is understaffed, but the level of service to its constituents has not decreased.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked LARRY HAUGSNESS, Director, Field Operations Department, to elaborate on the sidewalk program. MR. HAUGSNESS replied that the program is targeted to repairing existing sidewalks in older neighborhoods. Where there are sidewalks missing, a variety of sources have been used to address those issues, typically with grants through Neighborhood Services. He verified for COUNCILMAN McDONALD that the sidewalk repairs would be permanent. COUNCILMAN McDONALD pointed out that for cost effectiveness repairs should be done where needed all at once. MR. HAUGSNESS stated that the \$75,000 requested in this budget to start the program would be primarily complaint driven because this amount would not cover every crack in every sidewalk across the City. COUNCILMAN MACK asked whether the sidewalks are owned by the property owner or the City and whose ultimate obligation it is to maintain them. MR. HAUGSNESS replied that under the current City of Las Vegas Ordinance sidewalks are in public right-of-way, but the property owner is responsible for their maintenance. COUNCILMAN McDONALD stated that it is very hard to set policy that

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

someone has to fix his or her sidewalk when the cause may be from a reason such as the sidewalk being cracked due to an exposed tree root coming from the adjacent neighbor. This issue needs to be addressed further. MR. HAUGSNESS indicated that all the details of the program have not been identified yet and he will get back to each Council member with a recommendation on what it would be pursuing.

COUNCILMAN BROWN directed that the refurbishing of sidewalks be a pilot program and come back in one year and evaluate the data because there are some legal issues and certainly some long-term ramifications. If the program is successful, this year it may cost \$75,000, next year \$750,000 and the following year \$7.5 million. MR. HAUGSNESS clarified with COUNCILMAN BROWN that both City staff and an outside contractor would be used for the repairs. This could be added to the City's annual concrete contract.

COUNCILMAN REESE asked whether there are any federal monies available, as far as repairing sidewalks for older neighborhoods. MR. HAUGSNESS replied that he is not certain of any available monies. However, there might be funds available through CDBG. In fact, the sidewalk repair on Stewart Avenue is through CDBG funds. COUNCILMAN REESE directed the City Manager to check with Neighborhood Services to ascertain whether federal money is available for sidewalk repairs.

COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that this program could not be successful because once one neighbor hears that the City repaired a sidewalk, another would come forward requesting the same thing. If repairing sidewalks becomes a priority, those capital improvements, such as a community center, a road project or a new ballpark, would have to be deferred. He suggested that those costs be tracked closely if it is a mixture between City labor and contractual. MR. HAUGSNESS stated that they would look at a cost-sharing program with the property owners.

MR. VINCENT stated that one of the things the City has done is centralize facility and parks maintenance. For the last couple of years the City has been trying to identify operating revenues on an on-going annual basis for MR. HAUGSNESS' budget to deal with these issues. MR. HAUGSNESS' team does a great job in working with the different departments and the City Manager to prioritize those needs. Field Operations' routine maintenance and repairs should be put into an overall operating cost.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN McDONALD reiterated that during the pilot program repairs have to be made on the most extreme cases. He directed the City Attorney's office to look into the liability of injuries resulting from an un-repaired sidewalk. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC replied that he would provide an attorney-client memo regarding liability.

SHARON SEGERBLOM, Director, Neighborhood Services, discussed with COUNCILMAN McDONALD the proposed reconstruction of the Mirabelli Center. She stated that \$1.3 million would come from the County and approximately \$200,000 through federal funding. She stated that Metro would move out in March of 2002 and the City would have the architectural design ready at that point. The Interlocal Agreement came before the Council about six months ago, and the money would have to be spent by the end of 2002. She does not believe that the County would extend the Interlocal Agreement. She further stated that Architectural Services feels that tearing down the existing facility and rebuilding a new facility would provide a better product and save the City money. COUNCILMAN McDONALD stressed that everything be ready for construction of the new Mirabelli Center to ensure that federal funding is not lost. MR. VINCENT pointed out that after the center is refurbished, there is the issue of the on-going operations and staffing. This budget does not contemplate that at this time.

MS. SEGERBLOM discussed with COUNCILMAN McDONALD that the federal money has to meet a specific national objective and serve a group of certain people. Seniors fall into that category for service to be provided. Meetings will be held with neighborhoods, and staff will work with Leisure Services for a design that would be as personnel efficient as possible.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked whether the existing Mirabelli Center staff could cover the needs of this new facility or whether additional staff would be needed. Additionally, she asked whether Block Grant dollars could be utilized for the operation of the center. MS. SEGERBLOM replied that staff could be cut depending on how the building is configured and on the services provided. As far as federal funding for staff, there is a federal funding cap of how much administrative money can be spent. Much of the staffing and 15% of the funds go towards administering the programs.

DR. BARBARA JACKSON, Director, Leisure Services, further indicated that the center would require a minimum of three full-time classified employees: a Center Coordinator and two recreational leaders. Consideration would have to be given as to how long the center would be operating during the day, how many days a week and on the number of programs.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN McDONALD concurred that it would be more feasible to tear the building down and rebuild it using a better design and that staffing for that new center would come under the 2002 budget cycle. The most important issue is that federal funding is not lost. There is a need for this facility in this particular area. COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked whether interns from UNLV, as well as the community college and/or volunteers could be used. DR. JACKSON replied that interns could be used on a part-time hourly basis. However, on-site staff is required to control the operations and programs on a daily basis.

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that the City's budget policy states that as it gets into the major capital programming it is part of those approval processes and allocation of dollars, and there is an operating expense tied into it. Again, he cautioned not to create an expectation that may not be able to be met. He hopes that the Mirabelli Center operational expenses are being tied into the overall project, as this is in the adopted City Council policy. COUNCILMAN McDONALD concurred, but stated that everything needs to be looked at across the board. He acknowledged the great service the Public Information Office provides. However, he would rather have community centers for entire communities providing a variety of programs, than a TV channel promoting the City of Las Vegas or mailing a newsletter to residents. Priorities need to be looked at and innovative ways found to utilize the City's TV channel, such as selling some of the City's TV airtime, contractually and legally.

MR. VINCENT clarified that the \$75,000 sidewalk program was carved out of the fuel tax revenue and could be programmed for a different project. However, KCLV Channel 2 was set up as an Enterprise Fund, and the percentages of the franchise tax by agreement are going to the station and could not be used anywhere else or go to a community center.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD further stated that the Council might have to look at capping salary increases. He reiterated that demographics have shown that a community center is needed at the Mirabelli location, the senior population has grown in this particular area, and that the services are not being met.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD stated that with the City of Henderson tax shift and the Motor Vehicle Privileged Tax discussions in Carson City, it is very important that everyone understands that a lot of that pie are non-discretionary items. The irony is that those things that the Council has discretion on are those things that truly impact the senior citizens, the children and the quality of life: community centers, parks, graffiti-type programs, recreational programs,

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

track break programs, and the Senior Law Project. In order to maintain that same level of service, either the fees would have to be increased or increased taxation. These issues are not being addressed by most of the State Legislators. The City of Henderson tax shift passed out of the Assembly in its current form, and much more needs to be done on the Senate side of the house. She commended and thanked MORSE ARBERRY, DOUG BACHE, BOB BEERS, BARBARA CEGAVSKE, CHRIS GIUNCHIGLIANI, and WENDELL WILLIAMS, who supported the City's position in the Legislature and realized that they too represent City residents. TOM COLLINS, SHARRON ANGLE, and DAN GUSTAVSON, who do not represent City of Las Vegas residents, also supported the City. She is sorry that other assembly people, such as VONNE CHOWNING, JOHN LEE, DENNIS NOLEN and KATHY VON TOBEL, felt that they could justify shifting and subsidizing the City of Henderson and did a great disservice to the City of Las Vegas' constituents.

(11:30 – 12:17)

**2-1916**

COUNCILMAN MACK thanked the City Manager and her staff for the work done on the tentative budget, as well as the different department heads for their compelling arguments. It has been clearly displayed that the City of Las Vegas has had a double-digit economy growth for the last several years, but with the single-digit growth, everyone has to tighten his belt. He stated that he would leave one of his liaison positions vacant to show leadership from the Council office. He expressed his appreciation for being able to utilize staff from different departments to fill that need. Of course, the City is being greatly affected by the passing of AB 653 and AB 457. He hopes that the City can work together with the Senate to reach a compromise. Public safety and fire and police protection are important and a great piece of the City's budget, and there is not enough room for any allowances. Tremendous strides have been made in accessibility and technology by using the Internet and the ability of making payments on-line. These efforts need to continue, and he applauded the City's efforts in this regard.

COUNCILMAN MACK stated that he has held Ward 6 Town Hall meetings on-line, costing less than a few hundred dollars, that provided a venue for his constituents to communicate. He plans to have regularly scheduled face-to-face Town Hall meetings, as well as continuing on-line meetings. City services are not evenly distributed, and he proposed that a strong needs assessment be done throughout the entire community to ascertain what needs are not being met. He would like to explore the possibility of using concession stands in City parks as a way to help fund other park projects. They could be used year-round as a revenue drive for the City. Currently, these concession stands are turned over to sport leagues to generate revenue for their teams.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

Additionally, he suggested looking into the possibility of having water, soda or candy vending machines in City Parks or City owned properties and having banner ads on the Internet. Also, the City is looking at advertising opportunities in City parks with billboards that could possibly be revenue driven. Finally, the City's looking at locating cell towers on City-owned properties.

COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that the City is at a crossroads because the City needs to look at staffing positions, not only what they would cost today, but for the long-term. This needs to be discussed during negotiations. When speaking about capital improvements, the City needs to look at a balanced approach and take into consideration the labor costs that go into these projects as well.

MR. VINCENT addressed some of COUNCILMAN MACK's concerns. He stated that the City is looking at Requests for Proposals for the vending franchise, as well as the possibility of food vending on the streets. But issues need to be resolved with the Bureau for the Blind. The City is actively looking at doing advertising signage as specified by the Planning Department, not only in parks, but also in all City-owned property. The City is currently working on four leases for cell towers on City-owned property.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY thanked staff for presenting an informative workshop that helped him understand how the City's budget works. He spoke to residents of Ward 5 regarding potential capital improvement projects that they would like to see in their neighborhood. He informed them that currently the City is dealing with some important issues in Carson City that will seriously affect the City of Las Vegas. He stressed the importance of constituents getting involved and asked that they contact their Assembly representatives and Senators to let them know the impact this would have on the City.

Regarding the sidewalk program, he hopes that Wards 2, 4 and 6 understand that as these wards continue to grow that they do not allow their neighborhoods to become like the older neighborhoods. There are neighborhoods that he thinks the City turned its head away from a long time ago, and now these neighborhoods are paying the price because those issues were not addressed when the problem first arose. He asked that he be involved in discussions related to sidewalk right-of-way, especially when dealing with older neighborhoods. On the issue of how community centers are staffed, COUNCILMAN WEEKLY pointed out that the same should be true of parks.



SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MR. VINCENT explained that as part of the Strategic Planning they recognized the need to identify maintenance cost, separate from operating costs, on a square footage basis for a facility and on an acreage basis for an open space. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY expressed a concern that City of Las Vegas parks are not being utilized. He stated that his office deals a lot with outreach type programs for Ward 5, which were not earmarked in the budget and asked that this be further explored as to how to continue these outreach programs and establish partnership with different entities. He found this budget workshop very informative and hopes that the public understands that the City is facing a serious crisis.

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked what constitutes the largest percentage of non-labor funding in each department. MR. VINCENT replied that one of the policies adopted last year was that the City was going to change its practice for budgeting for non-labor expenditures and that it was to be used as a cost-trending technique. This is the first year this has been done. He explained that the City's current fiscal year budget for these non-labor, non-discretionary expenditures was about \$141 million. After looking at what the City had been spending, its anticipated expenses for 2001 and a forecast budget for 2002, \$3 million was cut out of this non-labor budget. Several meetings were held with all City directors to identify what those priority initiatives were. He expressed his appreciation to all directors for their cooperation with this very difficult budget. Issues arose for example in the Detention Facility with linen and food contracts, and there would be some contractual increases. Therefore, roughly \$1.2 million had to be added back for non-labor types of expenses for Detention. A similar issue arose with Fire and Rescue Services, and about \$1.4 million was added back, as well as for Municipal Court, Public Works and Field Operations. Field Operations would get a larger annual operating budget to let them decide how they wanted to handle that limited resource with the large amount of requests that they get for maintenance and repairs. That total is about \$4.3 million. That is a net increase of \$1.3 million, less than a 1% increase. The largest component is for professional services and contracts. CANDACE FALDER, Finance Department, discussed with COUNCILMAN BROWN that all the transfers out of the General Fund to the capital projects and other funds fall through the non-departmental category. There has been a reduction in what has been spent from the General Fund to the capital projects. Therefore, a decrease will be seen in that, but it has been offset by the utility increases, which also sit in the non-departmental category.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MR. VINCENT clarified for COUNCILMAN BROWN that some of the reasons for departments moving upward in their non-labor expenditures could be contractual increases, such as linen, bedding, and food contracts for the Detention Facility. COUNCILMAN BROWN requested a report before the final budget indicating non-labor costs by department for fiscal year June 30, 2000, stating the reason why the numbers have increased for the projected budget. Some seem to be extreme and some holding firm for the past two years. He discussed the different types, of printed information generated by the City, such as the City Talk newsletter, monthly colored calendars from certain departments and postcards. Even though the total may be only about \$100,000, some of those are certainly unnecessary. These savings could be used towards a priority that this Council feels is more appropriate.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD and COUNCILMAN McDONALD requested a copy of the memo from CANDACE FALDER talking about the cost trending by department.

MAYOR GOODMAN read into the record a letter that is being sent on behalf of the City Council to each member of the Nevada State Assembly. “On behalf of the City Council of Las Vegas, I am writing an ardent opposition to Assembly Bill 457, the Bill that removes the Motor Vehicle Privileged Tax from the consolidated tax allocated to local governments. The loss of local revenues as directed by this Bill will seriously undermine and impair the financial stability of cities and towns in Clark County. The passage of this Bill will create a \$9 million operating deficit for Las Vegas in 2002 and a \$19 million operating deficit in 2003. As constructed, this Bill will necessitate a substantial reduction of services to the citizens of Las Vegas. Recognizing that 53% of our budget is for public safety, it is assumed that a large portion of this loss will be felt in reduction to police, fire and other public safety services. We understand the Legislature’s need to fund schools, but it cannot come at the cost of compromising public safety or other local programs vital to the health and welfare of our community in all stages of life and in all aspects of our community. If you have any questions regarding our position on this matter, please contact the Mayor’s Office.”

COUNCILMAN BROWN reiterated that publications generated by the City are not critically necessary, especially in this budget cycle. The labor involved is substantial. It may not be just the dollar savings, but it may be prioritizing that staff person involved in these publications and doing something perhaps more critical.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

He addressed the capital projects. Each Council member is very protective and territorial at times in representing their respective areas with a passion, be it sidewalks, parks or community centers. One of the components discussed at last year's Strategic Planning session was taking a citywide approach versus a ward approach. He used the Bettye Wilson Soccer Complex as an example of a project that should not be considered a specific ward project. When looking at capital programming it needs to be ascertained that perhaps there might be a citywide priority for a specific project.

He outlined the course of events regarding the Downtown Community Center, where the City entered into negotiations with the old First Baptist Church of Las Vegas. This agreement was unanimously approved by the City Council. His concern is that the community's perception is that this building has been designated as a Downtown cultural center. In fact, the Las Vegas Arts Commission referred to it as a Downtown Cultural Center Asian Ad-hoc Committee. The City put this expectation out too far in advance for the public and a situation may result if funding does not become available or if there is a priority need over this specific location. If a need assessment for a senior center were made, he finds it difficult to believe that a downtown center would be more needy than one for the northwest area that does not have any senior centers. This area has a large percentage of retirees. It is a great project for downtown, but an assessment needs to be made from a citywide perspective, in order to be fair for the northwest senior population, as well as the downtown senior population. From a capital-programming standpoint, he is concerned that there are proposed projects that need to be reviewed again before they are committed to the budget cycle. He feels strongly that the capital component of this budget needs to be taken separately over the next few weeks, with either the Council as a whole or a sub-committee walking through with Public Works, Neighborhood Services, Leisure Services and taking a hard look at these dollars.

MAYOR GOODMAN suggested that a subcommittee meeting be formed of the Council as a whole for the purpose of reviewing the capital improvements projects, in particular parks, streets, and sewer. He verified with CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that the meeting would have to comply with the open meeting law.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that if the goal was to get this amended capital plan into the final budget, the filing date is June 1<sup>st</sup> or mid May. If it cannot be met for mid May, then the budget would have to be amended or augmented later.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN MACK suggested that the Council possibly look at the capital improvement projects as an amendment after the Legislative session is over. MAYOR GOODMAN concurred and stated that the budget would then be on an augmented phase.

COUNCILMAN BROWN requested that the Council receive a status report on the capital improvements at the second City Council meeting in May, because he would not support going forward with what is listed as a capital program with the intent to augment.

COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that the largest impact of the budget is the labor costs. He recommended that the Council continue with the hiring freeze and that along with those positions that are frozen, the Council take a second look at existing vacancies with the intent to eliminate those that the Council feels are unnecessary. He asked the City Manager's Office to put forth some type of justification as to why some of these positions should not be eliminated and if they are eliminated, the Council could be looking at a potential revenue-neutral budget request. He asked MR. VINCENT whether the 47 positions out of the 60 proposed are through Enterprise Funds or come from areas that generate the revenue to pay for those positions. MR. VINCENT replied that 40 of the positions would be coming from the fire safety initiative revenue. The other seven are the Detention positions that would be funded in the General Fund, but from the bed rental revenue. COUNCILMAN BROWN verified with MR. VINCENT that if those positions are created and funded by a revenue source, those positions would be affected if that revenue source diminishes.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked CITY MANAGER VALENTINE whether those City employees that are subject to all the benefits could not be terminated because they are under a collective bargaining agreement. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that there is a specific process outlined in the agreement on what is done if the need for those positions or the funding source goes away. Those positions would be eliminated. Those employees have certain rights to apply for other positions or to be called back if the need arises for similar positions. MAYOR GOODMAN pointed out that placing employees in another capacity would not solve the City's problems, as far as the budget is concerned. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE explained that would have to be for an open position depending on certain job classifications. If there were no openings in those job classifications, for example if this was a position that was specifically tied to the jail under this program, if there was no other similar position in the City, then they would have no other opportunity. However, if that person were an Office Assistant II who was working in Detention and Enforcement, they would have an opportunity to fill the first opening that occurred for an Office Assistant II anywhere in the City.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MAYOR GOODMAN cautioned that a distinction be drawn between a general employee in a general capacity from somebody who is being hired to fill a specific function that is involved with the Enterprise Funds. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE stated that under the collective bargaining agreement, there is no distinction between whether or not positions are under General or Enterprise Funds. A distinction is made by job classification. If a position is eliminated due to a reduction in force, procedures and rules outlined in the contract agreement must be followed in order to eliminate that position. The City would not be liable if it follows those procedures and rules.

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that of the six Non-General Funded positions approved out of the Enterprise Funds, if those revenue sources do not generate the revenues to cover the positions, whether the positions are eliminated or would other funds be needed to supplement that position hired under the intent of getting paid out of revenues. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that it depends on the position and the value of that position. Therefore, COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that the Council needs to perhaps look at a policy that is very specific, abiding by all contractual agreements, but sends a clear message that if someone is hired with revenues that are supposed to be generated and are not, the position is eliminated. He has the sense that positions, both General and Non-General Funds, are created with an expectation that the dollars will be raised and if those dollars are not raised, there is no recourse but to find other funding.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE reiterated that if a department, such as Building and Safety, was not generating revenue for a position and it had to be supplemented from the General Fund, then a decision would be made based on the impact to the level of service. If the Council were comfortable with the impact, then the position would be eliminated.

CLAUDETTE ENUS, Director, Human Resources, clarified that currently a position can be eliminated without violating the City's collective bargaining agreement. Advertised by clearly articulating in the job specification that it is for a specific project or simply for the term of the funding. She clarified CITY MANAGER VALENTINE's comments by adding that if the person was in a classification such as an Office Specialist II and there was a less senior individual on the payroll working in another department under the same title, that person would have the right to eliminate that less senior individual.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MAYOR GOODMAN verified with MS. ENUS that the less senior individual would be reduced in force, at the same time complying with all of the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement that governed the manner of the reduction in force. MR. VINCENT added that this would apply to any position, regardless of where it is funded.

COUNCILMAN BROWN verified with MR. VINCENT that the City's projected revenue growth for this budget is between 4 and 4.5% and the projected labor cost increase for the existing payroll employees is 7.97%. COUNCILMAN BROWN stressed for the record that he does not believe any existing position in the City of Las Vegas is in jeopardy of being eliminated. There is too much growth and efficiency occurring, and the City is really doing more with less. However, he has great concerns for the future workforce. A bureaucratic nightmare is that people feel they are entitled to future positions. He wants to personally examine creating positions with existing revenues with the understanding that if those revenues were not available, the position would be eliminated. Additionally, also look at some of the contractual obligations, such as longevity. He believes that longevity is something that existing employees are entitled to. However, for a future position, longevity should be addressed. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE clarified that longevity is included in the collective bargaining agreement. For appointive positions that is discretionary.

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that those types of benefits should be looked at in the future to enable the City to hire differently and bring on a different workforce that may not cost 8% annually. The City needs to work with the labor union to address this issue. He does not believe that anyone is entitled to a future position in the City. MR. VINCENT added that a great amount of the 8% increase is tied into the 40% entire compensation package: insurance and medical benefits, longevity, and COLA. COUNCILMAN BROWN stressed that he would be opposed to taking anything away that is a contractual obligation. Again, he reiterated that he wants to look at future positions, be it internally, externally, or private. It has to be done for the future security of the City's budget. He does not want to put his successors in a position where they would have no discretion as a City Council. He wants to hopefully lay the foundation that in 10 years they would be better off than what is projected today.

MS. ENUS indicated that Human Resources is working closely with the City Employees Association. They are also working with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services by receiving training in Interest Base Bargaining and setting up regular meetings to represent the interests of the Mayor and Council. Training is set to start in September or October of 2001 in

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

conjunction with the CEA. COUNCILMAN BROWN added that he spoke with some CEA members who are progressive enough to understand that the Council does not want to harm, but instead help.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD addressed the issue of seniority and how it would be handled in case a position is eliminated. MS. ENUS replied that the steps outlined under the collective bargaining would need to be followed. Normally, it is the least senior individual who would be let go, in terms of overall time with the entity. COUNCILMAN McDONALD further clarified with MS. ENUS that the vast majority of positions being funded are CEA, other than the fire and police.

MAYOR GOODMAN pointed out that the Council needs to be cautious as to what is made available because once you allow somebody to rely on a particular financial situation, it is difficult to change it to their detriment. COUNCILMAN BROWN reiterated that he is not speaking about existing employees or existing benefits. MAYOR GOODMAN added that in the future this needs to be addressed in such a way that people clearly understand that they are not getting an entitlement or a vested right, but rather a privilege. However, it is a revocable privilege if the condition changes. COUNCILMAN BROWN stated that the entire existing City's workforce needs to be part of that identification for any future workforce.

TOMMY RICKETT, President, Las Vegas City Employee's Association, stated that he has been with the City for 12 years and is proud of being a City employee. He committed that as CEA President he would get the information out and that employees have a responsibility to provide essential services for taxpayers, as well as meeting those obligations under the collective bargaining agreement in good faith. He commended MS. ENUS for working together with the CEA to address problems and reach solutions to those problems.

MR. RICKETT clarified for COUNCILMAN McDONALD by reading Article 21 of the Labor Contract regarding reduction in force. The only change to the procedure for reducing staff is that when all other criteria are equal, the selection will be based on the employees' birthdays. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE indicated that staff would like to bring back to the Council ideas that would control labor and labor associated costs, including a survey to be done by MS. ENUS regarding voluntary separation to see if it would be cost-effective.

SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001

Item 1 – Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COUNCILMAN BROWN reiterated his request for a report indicating non-labor costs by department for fiscal year June 30, 2000 stating why the numbers have increased for the projected budget. In addition, he requested information on the printing cost of informational materials the City mails out. He further reiterated that it would behoove the City to get a better understanding on a citywide approach as it relates to capital projects. Finally, he suggested that the hiring freeze continue and be taken one step further by having the City Manager create an evaluation for those positions that could possibly be eliminated if the need is not there, with the intent of creating a budget proposal this year that would be neutral, as far as the new positions that are non-revenue generated.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD stated that there is a possibility the City will have fewer revenues, as it relates to the State Legislature, and the Council should start looking at different scenarios to be prepared to immediately embark upon.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked CITY MANAGER VALENTINE to examine the possibility of going to a four-day workweek and to provide information and analysis on the labor costs related to a four-day workweek, as well as its advantages and disadvantages. She replied that currently the City offers a 9-80 program, which gives an employee a four-day workweek every other week. The department director is allowed to make the determination whether or not the office still maintains a certain level of services and has business operations open for the convenience of the public. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS clarified for COUNCILMAN McDONALD that the City of Henderson is on a 37.5-hour workweek with 30-minute lunches.

MAYOR GOODMAN commented that the public is now aware where the City of Las Vegas stands and invited anyone to contact their City Council representative, himself or the City Manager with any ideas that might address these issues.

(12:17 – 1:25)

**2-3420**



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**  
**SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS**  
**CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**  
**MEETING OF: APRIL 25, 2001**  
**BUDGET WORKSHOP**

---

**DEPARTMENT: FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES**

**DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT**

☐

**CONSENT**

☒

**DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

Discussion and review of the Fiscal Year 2002 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

**Fiscal Impact**

☒

**No Impact**

**Amount:**

☐

**Budget Funds Available**

**Dept./Division:**

☐

**Augmentation Required**

**Funding Source:**

**PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

Review and discussion of FY2002 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 13, 2001.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

No Action Required

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

FY2002 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

**MOTION:**

None required

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See all related discussion under Item 1.

(9:07 – 1:25)

**2-3420**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE  
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS  
CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
MEETING OF: APRIL 25, 2001  
BUDGET WORKSHOP**

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

Items raised under this portion of the City Council Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19<sup>th</sup> Street, asked for clarification of what is ADQC. MR. VINCENT replied that it a consulting firm hired to do a study of Public Works operations.

MR. FARLOW asked how operations would be funded when the bonds are retired. MR. VINCENT replied that the City does not fund any operations out of bond proceeds. He further discussed with MR. FARLOW that this budget does not contemplate the maintenance of trails once they are completed.

MR. FARLOW addressed the issue of the Municipal Court and that it seems there is an implication that a person is guilty from the beginning.

He commended COUNCILMAN MACK for not hiring another liaison position. However, as a resident, he truly believes liaisons are extremely important to the public. He commended SUSIE MARTINEZ for her helpfulness. COUNCILMAN REESE explained that he had three of the best liaisons and when COUNCILMAN WEEKLY was appointed to the City Council, he only has two. The two liaisons have maintained the quality of service he requires, but he would never ask other Council members to give up their third liaison.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD commented that she has two college-educated Cum Laude MPAs who work and deliver tremendous customer service for the constituents. She is pleased that even with three, the labor costs are less than some with two.

(1:25 – 1:30)

**3-2340**

# *City of Las Vegas*

## SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2001 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that while he was in Carson City to play in a basketball game, three different sources asked him if he had heard the rumor that he was out to get two City employees that are State legislators. This gave him great concern. By coincidence one of the employees in question was playing in the same basketball game. He has known MORSE ARBERRY for over 15 years and asked him who might have started the rumor. The rumor supposedly stated that WENDELL WILLIAMS was an ineffective legislator. COUNCILMAN BROWN differed by stating that MR. WILLIAMS took the annexation bill that was six-feet under, resurrected it, and personally took charge with successful results. COUNCILMAN BROWN further stated that he does not take too many things personally, but when someone puts his character in question, it becomes personal. He further stated he has tremendous respect for MR. WILLIAMS and MR. ARBERRY for their work as legislators and it is not in his character, nor will it ever be, to use that kind of threat.

(1:30 – 1:34)

**3-2604**

MAYOR GOODMAN thanked the City Manager's Office for preparing an excellent informative presentation, as well as MR. VINCENT and his staff.

1:34 – 1:35)

**3-2766**

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:35 P.M**



SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF  
APRIL 25, 2001  
NOTES AND DIRECTIVES

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY directed staff to provide COUNCILMAN BROWN with information regarding the acquisition of the church located on Ninth Street and Bridger Avenue, which the City Council approved to be converted into a community center.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD requested that staff explore the privatization for a Public Defender.

MAYOR GOODMAN directed the City Manager to explore the possibility of replacing the Public Defender with private attorneys and to discuss this issue with Public Defender, MORGAN HARRIS, as well as the District Court Judges, as to whether or not this is feasible.

COUNCILMAN BROWN recommended that it would be in the best interest of the overall budget perspective that the positions requested by Municipal Court be brought back before the City Council in six months or in next year's budget cycle.

MAYOR GOODMAN directed COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD and COUNCILMAN REESE that, when they go into discussions regarding the Sheriff's budget, they ascertain whether or not the City could save money by having officers testify while they are on duty.

MAYOR GOODMAN directed CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC to explore the possibility of creating an affidavit to show that an effort has been made to have the officer present and to show the defendant at the pre-trial that in fact the officer intends to be present and he will not be there only if the person wants to make a deal at that time.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD stated that it is very hard to set policy that someone has to fix their sidewalk when the cause may be from a reason such as the sidewalk being cracked due to an exposed tree root coming from the adjacent neighbor. This issue needs to be addressed further. MR. HAUGSNESS indicated that all the details of the program have not been identified yet and he will get back to each Council member with a recommendation that he would like to pursue.

COUNCILMAN BROWN directed that the refurbishing of sidewalks be a pilot program and come back in one year and evaluate the data because there are some legal issues and certainly some long-term ramifications. If the program is successful, this year it may cost \$75,000, next year \$750,000 and the following year \$7.5 million.

# *City of Las Vegas*

## SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2001 NOTES AND DIRECTIVES

COUNCILMAN REESE directed the City Manager to check with Neighborhood Services to ascertain whether federal money is available for sidewalk repairs.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD reiterated that during the pilot program, repairs have to be made on the most extreme cases. He directed the City Attorney's office to look into the liability of injuries resulting from an un-repaired sidewalk. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC replied that he would provide an attorney-client memo regarding liability.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD directed that everything be ready for construction of the new Mirabelli Center to ensure that federal funding is not lost.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD directed to find innovative ways to sell KCLV Channel 2 TV time.

COUNCILMAN MACK stated that he would not fill one of his liaison vacant positions to show leadership from the Council office.

COUNCILMAN MACK noted that a strong needs-assessment be done throughout the entire community to ascertain what needs are not being met. He would like to explore the possibility of using concession stands in City parks as a way to help fund other park projects. They could be used year-round as a revenue drive for the City. Currently, these concession stands are turned over to sport leagues to generate revenue for their teams. Additionally, he suggested looking into the possibility of having water, soda or candy vending machines in City Parks or City-owned properties and having banner ads on the Internet. Also, the City is looking at advertising opportunities in City parks with billboards that could possibly be revenue driven on those sites as well. Finally, the City is looking at locating cell towers on City-owned properties.

COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that the City is at a crossroads because the City needs to look at staffing positions, not only today's cases, but for the long-term. This needs to be looked at during negotiations. When speaking of capital improvements, the City needs to look at a balanced approach and take into consideration the labor costs that go into these projects as well.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY asked that he be involved in discussions related to sidewalk right-of-ways because he has an issue with that as it relates to the older neighborhoods of Las Vegas.

# *City of Las Vegas*

## SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2001 NOTES AND DIRECTIVES

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY noted that staffing for community centers should be looked at, as well as staffing and maintenance for City parks.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY stated that his office deals a lot with outreach-type programs for Ward 5, which were not earmarked in the budget, and asked that this be further explored at how to continue these outreach programs and establish partnerships with different entities.

COUNCILMAN BROWN requested a report indicating non-labor costs by department for fiscal year June 30, 2000 stating the reason why the numbers have increased for the projected budget.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD and COUNCILMAN McDONALD requested a copy of the memo from CANDACE FALDER talking about the cost-trending by department.

COUNCILMAN BROWN suggested that a sub-committee or the Council as a whole discuss the capital improvements together with Public Works, Neighborhood Services, and Leisure Services. MAYOR GOODMAN directed CITY MANAGER VALENTINE to set a sub-committee meeting with the Council as a whole for the purpose of reviewing the capital improvement projects, in particular parks, streets, and sewer.

COUNCILMAN BROWN requested information on the printing costs for the informational material the City mails out.

COUNCILMAN BROWN suggested that the hiring freeze continue and take it one step further by having the City Manager create an evaluation for those positions that could possibly be eliminated if the need is not there, with the intent of creating a budget proposal this year that would be neutral, as far as the new positions that are non-revenue generated.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked CITY MANAGER VALENTINE to examine the possibility of going to a four-day workweek and provide information and analysis on the labor costs related to a four-day workweek.